

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

106th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 72

March 25, 1999, 7:02 p.m.
Page S-3389 Temp. Record

BUDGET RESOLUTION/Less Tax Relief, New Mandatory Education Spending

SUBJECT: Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 2000-2009 . . . S.Con. Res. 20. Domenici motion to table the Lautenberg (for Kennedy) amendment No. 161.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 54-45

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S.Con. Res. 20, the Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 2000-2009: will cut the debt held by the public (money that the Federal Government owes to creditors other than itself) in half over 10 years; will fully fund Medicare (all of the President's proposed \$9 billion in Medicare cuts were rejected; as a result, this budget will allow \$20.4 billion more in Medicare spending over the next 10 years); will save the entire \$1.8 trillion in Social Security surpluses over the next 10 years for Social Security; will provide for \$778 billion in net tax relief over the next 10 years (in contrast, the President's budget would increase the tax burden by \$96 billion net over 10 years), and will adhere to the spending restraints (discretionary spending caps and pay-go provisions) of the bipartisan budget agreement as enacted in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and the Taxpayer Reform Act of 1997 (the President's proposed budget, in contrast, would dramatically increase spending in violation of that bipartisan agreement, and would result in \$2.2 trillion more in total Federal debt at the end of 10 years than proposed in this Senate budget).

The Lautenberg (for Kennedy) amendment would reduce the net tax relief provided by this bill over 10 years by \$157 billion, and would adjust the functional totals in the resolution for the stated purposes of funding an unauthorized program to reduce the student-teacher ratio in public schools, and of paying the full Federal share (40 percent) of the costs of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). All of the funding would be provided as mandatory spending. Providing IDEA funding as mandatory spending rather than as discretionary spending as planned for under this budget resolution would also permit an additional \$43 billion in spending under the discretionary caps for education spending.

After debate, Senator Domenici moved to table the Kennedy amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

(See other side)

YEAS (54)			NAYS (45)		NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (54 or 100%)	Democrats (0 or 0%)		Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (45 or 100%)	Republicans (1)	Democrats (0)
Abraham	Helms		Akaka	Kennedy	McCain- ²	
Allard	Hutchinson		Baucus	Kerrey		
Ashcroft	Hutchison		Bayh	Kerry	EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE: 1—Official Business 2—Necessarily Absent 3—Illness 4—Other SYMBOLS: AY—Announced Yea AN—Announced Nay PY—Paired Yea PN—Paired Nay	
Bennett	Inhofe		Biden	Kohl		
Bond	Jeffords		Bingaman	Landrieu		
Brownback	Kyl		Boxer	Lautenberg		
Bunning	Lott		Breaux	Leahy		
Burns	Lugar		Bryan	Levin		
Campbell	Mack		Byrd	Lieberman		
Chafee	McConnell		Cleland	Lincoln		
Cochran	Murkowski		Conrad	Mikulski		
Collins	Nickles		Daschle	Moynihan		
Coverdell	Roberts		Dodd	Murray		
Craig	Roth		Dorgan	Reed		
Crapo	Santorum		Durbin	Reid		
DeWine	Sessions		Edwards	Robb		
Domenici	Shelby		Feingold	Rockefeller		
Enzi	Smith, Bob		Feinstein	Sarbanes		
Fitzgerald	Smith, Gordon		Graham	Schumer		
Frist	Snowe		Harkin	Torricelli		
Gorton	Specter		Hollings	Wellstone		
Gramm	Stevens		Inouye	Wyden		
Grams	Thomas		Johnson			
Grassley	Thompson					
Gregg	Thurmond					
Hagel	Voinovich					
Hatch	Warner					

Compiled and written by the staff of the Republican Policy Committee—Larry E. Craig, Chairman

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

The Kennedy amendment is massively irresponsible. Americans are being taxed at the highest rate in history, the Federal Government is going to collect far more in taxes over the next 10 years than it needs to meet its current spending plans, and the Federal Government is already spending more than \$1.7 trillion per year, yet this amendment would deny \$157 billion in the tax relief advocated by this resolution in order that even more money can be spent. Making matters even worse, every penny of the new spending would be as mandatory, entitlement spending. Mandatory spending has proven nearly impossible to control, and is the main reason we have had such huge budget problems in recent history. Making matters even worse, allowing all of that new mandatory spending will free up room under the discretionary spending caps to allow yet another \$43 billion in spending. Thus, this amendment would deny \$157 billion in tax relief in order to allow \$200 billion in new spending, most of which will be uncontrollable mandatory spending.

The new mandatory spending would be for the IDEA program and for an unauthorized program to federalize the hiring of local public school teachers in order to reduce the student-teacher ratio. We find the second purpose to be highly questionable. The first purpose, though, is not objectionable, and we take a backseat to no one in defending it. We Republicans have fought hard to increase IDEA funding since gaining the majority in Congress, and we have managed to nearly double its funding, within the budget, in just a few short years.

Overall, this budget resolution already proposes, in total, \$47.4 billion more in spending on education than the baseline from last year, and it proposes spending \$21.2 billion more than President Clinton requested. That spending will be within the spending caps. In just the next 5 years, discretionary spending will grow by \$31 billion. We are proud of being able to provide major increases in education funding within the budget. We oppose irresponsibly increasing funding by breaking the spending caps, denying tax relief, and increasing mandatory spending. We therefore strongly support the motion to table this amendment.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

The Kennedy amendment would still allow sizable tax relief to be given. All it would do is reduce that tax relief by about 20 percent in order to fund urgent educational priorities. We recognize that our Republican colleagues have proposed more in education spending than has the President, and we recognize that they intend to increase funding for certain key educational priorities, but we submit that they will still leave many urgent needs unaddressed. Under this budget, in the best case scenario, we are going to have to freeze the amount provided for college grants, we are going to have to deny access to Head Start services for 100,000 eligible children, we are going to have to eliminate 73,000 young people from the summer jobs program, and we are going to be unable to give 102,000 displaced workers training for new jobs. We have offered this amendment to address these and other shortcomings. The two main parts of the amendment would provide full funding for the IDEA program and full funding for the program to reduce the student-teacher ratio in public schools. Because all of that funding would be provided as mandatory spending, we would also then have room under the spending caps to meet a broad range of other educational needs. This amendment is meritorious. It has the support of numerous education groups. We urge our colleagues to support it as well.